



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL  
OF  
SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

(CONTINUING "HEBRAICA")

VOLUME XX

JANUARY, 1904

NUMBER 2

THE STRUCTURE OF HOSEA 4:1—7:7.<sup>1</sup>

BY WILLIAM RAINEY HARPER,  
The University of Chicago.

5. *Yahweh's Contention with Israel, on Account of Sins Encouraged by the Priests: 4:1—19.*<sup>2</sup>

We have here five strophes of twelve lines each; the measure is trimeter, rarely dimeter.

1) The thought of this section is complete: Yahweh has a contention with Israel; for wickedness is seen on every side. In this wickedness the religious guides, the priests, take the lead; and for their failure to perform their duty they shall be rejected, degraded, and put to confusion. Because of their example the people of Israel indulge in idolatry and adultery. May Judah not join in iniquity with Israel, who is committed to vice, and will continue until the enemy utterly confounds and destroys her!

2) The strophic divisions are very clearly marked:

Strophe I (vss. 1, 2, 3) describes the situation;

Strophe II (vss. 4, 14*d*, 5, 6) places the responsibility upon the priests;

Strophe III (vss. 7—10, 12*ab*) describes further the priests' responsibility;

Strophe IV (vss. 11, 12*cd*, 13, 14*abc*) pictures the madness of the people in their sensual indulgence;

<sup>1</sup> Here begins the fifth distinct section in Hosea. For a similar treatment of sections 1—4 see *AJSL.*, Vol. XVII, October, 1900.

<sup>2</sup> I have employed the same phraseology here and in other headings as will appear in my forthcoming volume on *Amos and Hosea* in the *International Critical Commentary*.

Strophe V (vss. 15–19) depicts Israel's sins and her consequent destruction.

3) The following modifications of the text are suggested:<sup>3</sup>

(a) The transposition of vs. 12*ab* to precede vs. 11, thus leaving a better connection with vs. 10; and, as well, a better connection with vs. 12*cd*; a much better arrangement for the circumstantial clause in vs. 12*a*; and no good ground, such as existed before, for regarding vs. 11 as an interpolation,<sup>4</sup> notwithstanding its proverbial form and content.

(b) The transposition of vs. 14*d* to precede פִּהֶן, the last word in vs. 4. These words (ועם לא־יבין ילבט) (1) are evidently out of place where they are, the context contrasting הם (the priests) with the young women of the nation; (2) complete the symmetry of Strophe II, but destroy that of Strophe IV, in which they stand in אִתּ; (3) fit in perfectly with the last clause of vs. 4 as amended, adding still another circumstantial detail of the picture — *Yea, a people*, etc.; (4) on this supposition need no longer be regarded as a gloss.<sup>5</sup>

I (4:1) שמעו דבר יהוה

בני ישראל  
כי ריב ליהוה  
עם ישבי הארץ  
כי אִין־אמת ואִין־חסד  
ואִין־דעת אלהים בארץ:  
(2) אלה וכחש ורצח וגנב ונאף  
פרצו ודמים בדמים נגעו:  
(3) על־כן תאבל הארץ  
ואמלל כל יושב בה  
בחית השדה ובעוף השמים  
וגם־דגי הים יאספו:

II (4) אך איש אל־ירב

ואל יוכח איש  
ועמי<sup>6</sup> ככמרי<sup>7</sup>ו;  
(14*d*) ועם לא־יבין ילבט:

<sup>3</sup> As presented in *Amos and Hosea* (see above).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Ruben and Nowack.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Ruben and Nowack.

<sup>6</sup> For רַעַמָּה of אִתּ; so א, Beck, Böckel, Wellhausen, Bachmann, Ruben, G. A. Smith, Nowack, Oettli, *et al.*

<sup>7</sup> For כַּמְרִיבִי of אִתּ; so Beck, Böckel, Mosapp (*ZAW.*, Vol. V, p. 185), G. A. Smith, Oettli.

(5) (ה) כהֶן<sup>8</sup> פָּשַׁלְתָּה יוֹמָם<sup>9</sup>

וכשל גם־נביא עמך

לילה דמית<sup>9b</sup> אִמְךָ :

(6) נדמו עמי מבלי הדעת

כי אתה הדעת מאסת

ואמאסך<sup>10</sup> מכהן לי

ותשכח תורת אלהיך

אשכח בניך גם־אני :

(7) III כרבים כן חטאו<sup>11</sup>

כבודם בקלון הִמְירוּ<sup>12</sup> :

(8) חטאת עמי יאכלו

ואל עונם ישאו נפשו :

(9) והיה כעם ככהן

ופקדתי עליו דרכיו

ומעלליו אשיב לו :

(10) ואכלו ולא ישבעו

הזנו ולא יִתְרַצוּ<sup>13</sup> :

כי־את־יהוה עזבו [לשמר]<sup>14</sup> :

(12ab) עמי בעצו ישאל

ומקלו יגיד לו

(11) IV זנות יין ותירוש יקח־לב :

(12cd) כי רוח זנונים התעם<sup>15</sup>

ויזנו מתחת אלהיהם :

(13) על־ראשי ההרים יזבחו

ועל הגבעות יקטרו

תחת אֵלֹהִים ולבנה ואלה<sup>16</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Cf. G. A. Smith, who also joins כהֶן with vs. 5 as a vocative, while Beck reads כהֶן as a vocative at the end of vs. 4.

<sup>9</sup> So Wellhausen, Nowack, Oettli. Note the absence of the article in the corresponding לילה and the difficulty of rendering היום by day, as the context requires.

<sup>9b</sup> דמית of אִמְךָ.

<sup>10</sup> So many MSS. and most commentators. ואמאסאך of אִמְךָ is a copyist's error.

<sup>11</sup> Omit לו of אִמְךָ with §.

<sup>12</sup> So §, ט; and Geiger, *Urtext*, p. 316; Houtsma, *Theol. Tijdschrift*, Vol. IX, p. 60; Oort; Valetton; Ruben; G. A. Smith; cf. Buhl, *Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft*, 1881, pp. 227 sq. אִמְךָ, אִמְרִי, is unsuitable here.

<sup>13</sup> So ט; and Wellhausen, Oort, Valetton, Bachmann, Nowack. יִתְרַצוּ, is unintelligible here.

<sup>14</sup> This ought perhaps to be omitted; for (1) it is superfluous to the sense and rhythm, (2) no other case occurs of ל with the infinitive following עזבו.

<sup>15</sup> For התעם of אִמְךָ; so §, ט, and Graetz, Bachmann, Ruben, Wellhausen, Nowack, Oort, Oettli, Halévy.

<sup>16</sup> כי טוב צלה is omitted as a gloss; so also Nowack.

על־כן תזנינה בנותיכם  
 וכלותיכם תנאפנה;  
 לא־אפקוד על־בנותיכם כי תזנינה (14abc)  
 ועל־כלותיכם כי תנאפנה  
 כי הם עס־הזנות יפרדו  
 ועם הקדשות יזבחו

אס־זנה אתה ישראל (15) V  
 אל־יאשם יהודה  
 ואל־תבאז הגלגל  
 ואל־תעלו בית און  
 ואל־תשבעו בבאר שבע<sup>17</sup> חִי־יהוה;  
 כי כפרה סררה סרר ישראל (16)  
 עתה ירעם יהוה כנבש במרחב;  
 חבור עצבים אפרים הנח־לו; (17)  
 סֹד סבאים<sup>18</sup> הזנה הזנו  
 אהבו<sup>19</sup> קלון מגניה;  
 צרר רוח אותה בכנפיה (19)  
 ייבשו מִמִּזְבְּחֹתָם<sup>20</sup>;

# 6. *The Guilt of Priests and Princes: 5:1-14.*

This section has four strophes each of twelve lines, in the trimeter movement.

The thought is as follows: For lack of the knowledge of Yahweh Israel's priests and princes have defiled her, and she, consequently, has become faithless to him. A twofold punishment will be inflicted: an invading army from without; corruption and anarchy with civil war from within.

Strophe I (vss. 1-3) designates those who are responsible.

Strophe II (vss. 4-7) points out how these persons stand related to Yahweh.

<sup>17</sup> This insertion is justified by the parallelism which calls for the name of a town in this line, and by the analogy of Amos 5:5; 8:14. So Wellhausen and Nowack. Note also the paranomasia in the line as reconstructed.

<sup>18</sup> So Houtsma, *Theol. Tijdschrift*, Vol. IX, p. 60; Wellhausen; and Oettli.  $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{C}$ , קר, סבאים, defies interpretation.

<sup>19</sup> Omit  $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{C}$  of  $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{C}$  with  $\mathfrak{C}$ ,  $\mathfrak{S}$ ,  $\mathfrak{U}$ , and some Hebrew MSS.; so also Secker, Dathe, Kuinöl, Newcome, Hitzig, Oort, Valetton, Guthe, Graetz, Ruben, G. A. Smith, Nowack, Halévy, *et al.*

<sup>20</sup> For  $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{C}$  of  $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{C}$ ; so  $\mathfrak{S}$ ,  $\mathfrak{C}$ , Old Latin, Arabic, and Wellhausen, Winckler (*Untersuchungen*), Bachmann, Oort, Valetton, Ruben, Guthe, Nowack, Davidson (*Hastings's Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. II, p. 425), and Oettli.  $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{C}$  does not form a plural with the feminine ending. Cf. 8:11.

Strophe III (vss. 8–11) pictures the impending destruction as one coming from without, viz., a hostile army.

Strophe IV (vss. 12–14) gives the picture of the destruction from within, viz., corruption and anarchy.

The only modification of the text required by the strophical arrangement is the omission of the words **בצאנם ובבקרים** from vs. 6.

- (5:1) I
- שִׁמְעוּ זֹאת הַכְּהֲנִים  
וְהַקְשִׁיבוּ בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל  
וּבֵּית הַמֶּלֶךְ הָאֲזִינוּ  
כִּי לָכֶם הַמִּשְׁפָּט  
כִּי־פַח הֵייתֶם לַמִּצְפָּה  
וְרֶשֶׁת פְּרוּשָׁה עַל חִבּוּר;  
(2) וְשִׁחַת הַשָּׁטִיִּם <sup>21</sup> הַעֲמִיקוּ  
וְאִין <sup>22</sup> מוֹסֵר לְכֹלָם;  
(3) אֲנִי יָדַעְתִּי אֲפָרִים  
יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא־נִכְחַד מִמֶּנִּי  
כִּי אֶתְהָ <sup>23</sup> הִזְנִית אֲפָרִים  
נִטְמָא יִשְׂרָאֵל;  
(4) לֹא יִתְנוּ מֵעַלְלֵיהֶם II  
לְשׁוֹב אֱלֹהֵיהֶם  
כִּי רוּחַ זִנוּנִים בִּקְרָבָם  
וְאֶת־יִהוָה לֹא יָדְעוּ;  
(5) וְעֵנָה גֵּאוּן־יִשְׂרָאֵל בִּפְנֵיו  
וְאֲפָרִים <sup>24</sup> יִכְשְׁלוּ בְעֹנָם  
כֹּשֶׁל גַּם־יִהְיֶה עִמָּם;  
(6) יִלְכוּ <sup>25</sup> לִבְקֵשׁ אֶת־יִהוָה  
וְלֹא־יִמְצְאוּ חֶלֶץ מֵהֶם;  
(7) בִּיהוָה בִּגְדוּ  
כִּי־בָנִים זָרִים יִלְדוּ  
עֵתָה יֹאכְלֹם חֹדֶשׁ אֶת־חֻלְקֵיהֶם;  
(8) תִּקְעוּ שׁוֹפָר בְּגִבְעָה III  
חֲצֹצֵרָה בְּרִמָּה

<sup>21</sup> For  $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{A}$  **וְשִׁחַתָּה שָׁטִיִּם**; so Wellhausen, Cheyne (Cambridge Bible), Ruben, G. A. Smith, Nowack, Oort; cf. Valetton.

<sup>22</sup> For  $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{A}$  **וְאִין**; so Cheyne, *op. cit.*

<sup>23</sup> For  $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{A}$  **עֵתָה**; so Wellhausen and Oettli.

<sup>24</sup> **וְיִשְׂרָאֵל** of  $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{A}$  is to be omitted; because "Israel" and "Ephraim" are used interchangeably by Hosea (e. g., in 4:16 *sq.*; 5:3, 11 *sqq.*; 7:1; 11:8), hence one of them is superfluous in this line. So Oettli; cf. Wellhausen, who omits both.

<sup>25</sup> The words **בצאנם ובבקרים** of  $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{A}$  are a gloss, being unnecessary to the sense and superfluous from the metrical point of view.

- 26 הריעו בבית־אל  
 החרידו<sup>27</sup> בנימין :  
 (9) אפרים לשמה תהיה  
 ביום תוכחה  
 בשבטי ישראל הודעתי נאמנה :  
 (10) 28 היו שרי ישראל<sup>28</sup>  
 כמסיגי גבול  
 עליהם אשפוך כמים עברתי :  
 (11) עושק<sup>29</sup> אפרים רוצץ<sup>29</sup> משפט  
 כי הואיל הלך אחרי שון<sup>30</sup> :  
 (12) IV ואני כעש לאפרים  
 וקרב לבית ישראל<sup>31</sup> :  
 (13) וירא אפרים את־חליו  
 וישראל<sup>31</sup> את־מזרו  
 וילך אפרים אל־אשור  
 וישלח ישראל<sup>32</sup> אל־מלך ירב  
 והוא לא יוכל לרפא לכם  
 ולא־יִגְהֶה<sup>33</sup> מכם מזור :  
 (14) כי אנכי כשחל לאפרים  
 וככפיר לבית ישראל<sup>31</sup>  
 אני אני אטרק ואלך  
 אשא ואין מציל :

### 7. Fitful Repentance Insufficient to Remove Israel's Guilt:

5: 15—7: 7.

There are in this section five strophes of 12+10+10+10+12 lines, in trimeter and occasionally dimeter movement. With the

<sup>26</sup> אֶת, בית און, is a later term of reproach applied to Bethel; so Hitzig, Wellhausen, and Nowack. The insertion of the preposition is justified by the parallels in the two preceding lines.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. א and Old Latin; so Wellhausen, Graetz, Ruben, Nowack, and Oort. אֶת, yields no satisfactory meaning.

<sup>28</sup> אֶת, יהודה, here and in vss. 12 sqq. and 5:4 is a later substitute for יִשְׂרָאֵל; so Marti, *Geschichte d. isr. Religion*<sup>3</sup>, p. 119, and *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, col. 2122; and Nowack.

<sup>29</sup> So א and Old Latin; and Oort, Valetton, Wellhausen, Nowack, Oettli. אֶת points both participles as passives, but this renders the syntax rough and irregular.

<sup>30</sup> So א, ש, א, Old Latin; and Dathe, Bauer, Steiner, Simson, Cheyne (Cambridge Bible), Oort, Graetz, Ruben, Loftman, Guthe, G. A. Smith, Nowack, Oettli. אֶת, צר, is unintelligible.

<sup>31</sup> See note 28.

<sup>32</sup> The parallelism requires the insertion of a subject for יִשְׂרָאֵל, and "Israel" is better than "Judah;" so Bachmann, Nowack, and Cheyne (*Encyclopaedia Biblica*, col. 2331); for contrary view see Kuinöl, Sayce (*Babylonian and Oriental Record*, Vol. II, p. 21), Wellhausen, Oettli, and Halévy.

<sup>33</sup> אֶת, רִגְהָה; but since רִגְהָה is intransitive in Syriac, it is better to point as Hiph'il; so Wellhausen, Nowack, Bachmann, and Oettli.

arrangement proposed, unity of thought and a satisfactory conclusion are obtained.

Strophe I (5:15—6:3) represents Yahweh and Israel in soliloquy; the former, abandoning Israel, with the belief that in distress Israel will seek him; the latter, complacently suggesting that Yahweh will easily be found when wanted.

Strophe II (6:4—6) describes Yahweh's impatience with Israel's fitful repentance. Love is the thing he desires, not sacrifice.

Strophe III (6:7—10) describes the terrible wickedness of the Israelitish cities, a wickedness encouraged by the priests.

Strophe IV (6:11—7:2) suggests that a time of turning will surely come, although at this time they are so entangled in sin as not to feel the prickings of conscience.

Strophe V (7:3—7) declares that repentance is impossible in view of the immorality of the nation, from the king down.

In reply to the arguments of Marti, Volz, and others<sup>34</sup> who deny the authenticity of 5:15—6:3 it may be urged, with Nowack and G. A. Smith, (1) that 5:14 *sq.* is the climax of the threat of punishment and 6:4 cannot possibly be the continuation of 5:14. This is recognized by Volz, who therefore supposes that the original verses which formed the bridge from 5:14 to 6:4 have been forced out by this interpolation; but this is an unprovable hypothesis. (2) The connection between the prayer and what follows is very good if the prayer be taken as an expression of a "too facile repentance" rather than as an expression of genuine, heartfelt repentance. (3) The charge that 5:15—6:3 is only an echo of the thought and phraseology of the following verses (*cf.* 6:3 and 6:5) at once falls to the ground when the text of 6:3 is properly corrected. (4) There is nothing in the thought of the passage inconsistent with Hosea's times or with Hosea's teaching. (5) The argument against these verses based on the character of the language is very weak; *e. g.*, **בצר להם**, which Volz calls late; the use of **ב** with a noun to denote time is not at all uncommon—it occurs twice elsewhere in Hosea (10:10; 7:3(?)), and the use of **ל** to denote the genitive is certainly not late. The claim that **טרה** = *tear* occurs only in Job is strange in view of Hosea 5:14; Amos 1:11; Nahum 2:13. **רה** with **ל** in figurative sense, if it occurs only here, is of no value as an argument for either a late or an early date. It is scarcely to be supposed

<sup>34</sup> So, *e. g.*, Cheyne in W. R. Smith, *Prophets of Israel*, pp. xx *sqq.*; Grimm, *Liturgical Appendices*, pp. 69 *sqq.*



that a new name for the autumn rains was proposed in the times of Jeremiah; even if מִלְקוֹשׁ does not appear in earlier literature, it must have been in use. In any case the objection based on יוֹרֵה disappears when the text is emended to יִרְיֶה, as here. Moreover, as Cheyne and Volz acknowledge, this passage has linguistic and phraseological affinities with Hosea's style as seen in the context, viz., in the use of טָרַף, רָפָא, and לָכֹן נִשְׁוֹבָה, while "after two days" (6:2) is perhaps an allusion to "shall abide many days" in 3:4. "Knowledge of Yahweh" (6:3) is one of the fundamental ideas of Hosea (6:6, etc.).

Among other analyses of this material are the following: Ewald, 5:11-15; 6:1-5; 6:6-11a; 6:11b-7:7. Simson, 6:1-3; 6:4-6; 6:7-11; 7:1-7. Keil, 6:1-3; 6:4-11; 7:1-7. Cheyne (Camb. Bible), 6:1-3; 6:4-11a; 6:11b-7:7. Wellhausen, 5:10-6:4; 6:5 sq.; 6:7-11; 7:1 sq. (the last three divisions having no inner connection with each other); 7:3-7. Orelli sees no uniform progress of thought in chaps. 5-7; similarly G. A. Smith, who finds chap. 4 the "only really separable bit" of 4:1-7:7, but grants that there are slight breaks at 5:15 and 7:2. Nowack agrees with Wellhausen.

The following suggestions concerning the text, from the point of view of the structure, are submitted:

Strophe I. וְנָחִיָּה לַפְּנִי (1. 8) is to be taken as a gloss explaining יִקְיִמֵנו, thus relieving an exceedingly long line. Aside from this the parallelism is close and regular.

Strophe II. A line seems to be missing after 6:4, since עַל-כֵּן of 6:5 does not connect well with what immediately precedes. The line<sup>35</sup> is needed also to complete the otherwise almost perfect parallelism of the strophe.

Strophe III. Lines 5 and 6 are corrupt, but may perhaps be read, *and as troops lie in wait for a man so the priests hide themselves by the way*. 6:11a is of course a gloss.

Strophe IV. Vs. 11b is very doubtful; while 11c is to be connected with what follows, notwithstanding the chapter division.

Strophe V. Vs. 4, beginning כִּמּוֹ תִנּוּר, is a gloss explaining vs. 6.

I (5:15) אֵלֶךְ אֲשׁוּבָה אֶל-מִקְוִי  
עַד אֲשֶׁר-יִשְׁמָנִי<sup>36</sup> וּבִקְשׁוּ פָנִי

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Nowack.

<sup>36</sup> יִשְׁמָנִי; but neither of the meanings of this verb is suitable here. Cf. אֶ, ע, and Old Latin. So Wellhausen, Nowack, and Oettli.

בצר להם ישחרנני :  
 (6:1) [לאמר]<sup>37</sup> לכו ונשובה אליהוה  
 כי הוא טרף וירפאנו  
 ויך<sup>38</sup> ויחבשנו :  
 (2) יחינו מימים  
 ביום השלישי יקמנו<sup>39</sup>  
 (3) ונדעה נרדפה לדעת את־יהוה  
 כשחרנו כן<sup>40</sup> נמצאהו<sup>41</sup>  
 ויבוא כגשם לנו  
 כמלקוש יְרֻה<sup>42</sup> ארץ :

(4) II מֶה אֶעֱשֶׂה־לָךְ אֲפִרִים  
 מֶה אֶעֱשֶׂה־לָךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל<sup>43</sup>  
 וחסדכם כענן בקר  
 וכטל משמים הלך  
 \* \* \* \* \*

(5) על־כן חצבתי בנביאים  
 והרגתים באמרי פי  
 ומשפטי כאור<sup>45</sup> יצא :  
 (6) כי חסד חפצתי ולא־זבח  
 ודעת אלהים מעלות :

(7) III והמה כאדם עברו ברית  
 שם בגדו־בי :  
 (8) גלעד קרית פעלי און  
 עקבה מדם :  
 (9) וכהכי איש גדודים  
 חֲבָאִי<sup>46</sup> כהנים דרך

<sup>37</sup> Supplied by ♂ and §.

<sup>38</sup> So §; and Wellhausen, Bachmann, G. A. Smith, Nowack, Oettli. ♂, יך, is without analogy.

<sup>39</sup> For the omission of the words ונחיה לפניו, see above, p. 106.

<sup>40</sup> So Giesebrecht, *Beiträge zur Jesaiakritik*, p. 208; Wellhausen; Smend, *Alttest. Religionsgeschichte*, p. 210; Valetton; G. A. Smith; Nowack, and Oort; cf. Ruben. ♂, כשחר נכון.

<sup>41</sup> So ♂ and Old Latin, and authorities cited in note 40. ♂, מצא, .

<sup>42</sup> So ♂, §, Sebök, Perles (*Analekten*, p. 90), Nowack, Oort, Oettli. ♂, יְרֻה.

<sup>43</sup> See note 28.

<sup>44</sup> On the missing line see above, p. 106.

<sup>45</sup> So ♂, §, and Old Latin; and Dathe, Bauer, Rosenmüller, Hitzig, Ewald, Simson, Keil, Wünsche, Nowack, W. R. Smith (*Prophets*, p. 389), Orelli, Cheyne (Camb. Bible), Oort, Bachmann, Wellhausen, Graetz, Valetton, Ruben, Guthe, G. A. Smith, Oettli, Halévy. ♂, משפטיך אור is evidently an error.

<sup>46</sup> So ♂ and Old Latin; and Ruben; cf. Gardner (*AJSL.*, Vol. XVIII, p. 180). ♂, חֲבָר.

ירצחו<sup>47</sup> שכמה כִּי־זמה עשו :

(10) בבית־אל<sup>48</sup> ראיתי שערוריה

שם זָנִית<sup>49</sup> אפרים

נטמא ישראל

(11c) IV בשוּבִי שבות עמי

(7:1) ברפאי<sup>50</sup> לישראל

ונגלה עון אפרים

ורעות שמרון [נראו]<sup>51</sup>

כִּי־פעלו שקר וגנב־יבוא

פשט גדוד בחוץ

(2) ובל יעמדו<sup>52</sup> בלבבם

כל רעתם זכרתי

עתה סבבום מעלליהם

נגד פני היו

(3) V ברעתם ימשהו<sup>53</sup> מלך

(4) ובכחשיהם שרים כלם מנאפים

(5) יום מלכנו החלו

שרים חמת מיין

משך ידו את־לצאים

(6) כִּי־בערו<sup>54</sup> כתנור לבם בארבע

כל־הלילה ישן אִפְהֶם<sup>55</sup>

בקר הוא בער כאש להבה :

(7) כלם יחמו כתנור

ואכלו את שפטיהם

כל מלכיהם נפלו

איך־קרא בהם אלי

<sup>47</sup> The unusual use of the maqqēph here has often been noted. It furnishes strong traditional support for the arrangement of the line here adopted.

<sup>48</sup> So Wellhausen, Preuschen (*ZAW.*, Vol. XV, p. 30), Ruben, Oort, Nowack, Oettli. Cf. 10:15 and Amos 5:6.  $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{C}$ , בבית ישראל.

<sup>49</sup> So Wellhausen, Preuschen (*loc. cit.*), Nowack, Oettli. This is better than  $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{C}$ , זָנִית לְ; cf. *הַזָּנִית*, 5:3, where the same statement is made.

<sup>50</sup> This is supported by  $\mathfrak{C}$  and the parallel בשוּבִי; so also Oort.

<sup>51</sup> Some such word as this is required by the parallelism and the meter.

<sup>52</sup> The  $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{C}$  יאמר לְ is obscure and furnishes no satisfactory connection with the context. On this use of עמד cf. Deut. 25:8; and for the charge of fickleness thus preferred against Israel, cf. 4:1 *sqq.*; 6:7; 7:13; 10:4, 13; 11:12; 12:1.

<sup>53</sup> So Wellhausen, Oort, Valetton, and Nowack; but cf. Oettli.  $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{C}$  has ישמהו.

<sup>54</sup> So  $\mathfrak{C}$ .  $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{C}$  is קרבר, which furnishes no satisfactory meaning.

<sup>55</sup> So  $\mathfrak{S}$ ,  $\mathfrak{C}$ , and many Hebrew MSS.; also Dathe, Wünsche, Houtsma, Schmoller, Cheyne (Camb. Bible), W. R. Smith (*Prophets*, p. 413), Wellhausen, Valetton, Ruben, Guthe, Nowack, G. A. Smith, Oettli, *et al.*